

Susan Udin <sudin@acsu.buffalo.edu>
12/12/2003 12:44:01 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Mabel E. Echols OMB_Peer_Review/OMB/EOP@EOP
cc:
Subject: Peer review proposal

Joshua B. Bolten, Director, Office of Management and Budget,

Dear Mr. Bolten,
As a scientist, a professor of Physiology, and an NIH grantee, I am writing to oppose the "Peer Review and Information Quality" proposal. Although the idea of increased amounts of peer review seems appealing at first glance, deeper inquiry into the issue shows that the peer review that would be established by this proposal is highly undesirable. For OMB to vet dissemination of all scientific and technical research reports and analyses would inevitably delay implementation of many policies that can be of great benefit to the American public. In addition, it is entirely counterproductive to bar federally funded researchers from such peer review panels; these people are among the most highly qualified populations for producing objective and scientifically valid analyses. Many government agencies already make effective use of peer review. For particularly complicated issues, the National Academy of Sciences - not OMB - has the expertise to assemble groups of highly qualified experts to provide reports and reviews.

I also note that this proposal includes an across-the-board exemption of foreign affairs and national defense. This notable gap suggests that the purpose of the proposal is not to protect the American public but instead is to delay implementation of regulations that would require industry to change various practices that have a negative impact health and the environment.

Sincerely,

Dr. Susan Udin
Department of Physiology and Biophysics
State University of New York
Buffalo, NY 14214
e-mail: sudin@buffalo.edu
tel: 716 829-3571